

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 23:00:16 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #243
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 20 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 243

Today's Topics:

Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams) (2 msgs)
 Foreigner getting US liscence ?
 Give a VE \$5.60, walk
 Order pizza on your autopatch now (3 msgs)
 References for Code vs. No-Code Debate 82-90
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep! (2 msgs)
 The Great CODE Debate / Police Dispatchers

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Jul 93 13:11:54 GMT
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

nuts2u::little (little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com) wrote:

: Why do I have a feeling that 20 years from now we'll still be debating
: inane issues of the no-code history and the only new hams will be on
: VHF/UHF repeaters. Not because they're too lazy to learn Morse code, but
: because they won't be allowed to have outdoor antennas. While we fight
: amongst ourselves, our undoing is likely to be in the making. I just hope
: Phase 3D and follow ons are as effective as they say, because the only DX
: many hams will be able to do is from a hand held.

That's the way it's going here in Oregon. Washington county is going to
force hams to pay hundreds of dollars for antenna/tower permits. I wonder

how soon we will have to produce "environmental impact statements"?

: Stop whining and arguing about the past and figure out how to save the
: future. We could learn a *lot* from the NRA.

Very true. If ALL groups being persecuted with do-gooder, feel-good, while producing nothing laws supported each other, we might have some success defending our rights.

Every time the government takes responsibility from you, your freedom goes with it!

Of course it's awfully Politically Incorrect of me to say so.

The following is a post from a private email group for those involved in some aspect of the commercial fireworks business. The restrictions are becoming so severe that we are going to see the industry dwindle to a monopoly in many areas. It is already so here. Even such an apparently innocuous a substance as charcoal has been re-defined as a "hazardous material" since it allegedly might self combust! These bureaucrats have obviously never tried to light a barbeque!

> Subject: RE: WHAT IS EVERYONE GOING TO DO?

> Date: Fri, 09 Jul 93 15:46:00 -0700

> From: davids@ims.com

>

>

> GET ORGANIZED!!

> GET ORGANIZED!!

> GET ORGANIZED!!

> GET ORGANIZED!!

> GET ORGANIZED!!

> GET ORGANIZED!!

> GET ORGANIZED!!

>

> This, like the issue of ham antennas, scanners, etc. is another classic

> example of Socialist bullshit wherewith Our Illustrious

> Government (on your knees, peon scum) restricts everyone's rights because

> one careless asshole might stub its toe someday.

>

> The failure of each group being affected (gun owners, pyrotechnicians, hams,

> scanner monitoring enthusiasts, etc) to come AGGRESSIVELY to the defense of

> ALL the other groups ON PRINCIPLE, and REGARDLESS of any personal interest

> in the subject at hand one way or the other, is exactly analogous to the

> problem gun owners have with the Bolt Action Boys failing to support the

> owners of Evil Ass-ault rifles. Divide and conquer.

>

> There is no question whatsoever that, for instance, if the NRA, the ARRL, the

> pyrotechnicians, etc. etc. etc. were to form a political coalition to defend

> each other's rights, nobody's rights would be getting abridged. But as it is,
> only the NRA, because of its size and experience, has had any success in
> staving off the advance of the Police State. The rest of us have had to put up
> with progressively more and more totalitarian restrictions on what chemicals,
> radios, etc. etc. etc. we can buy.
>
> Is anybody defending the knife collectors? Our Illustrious and Exalted
> Government (On your FACE, worm!) passed more restrictions a while back on
> switchblade knives. So far, NRA has managed to keep them from outlawing guns,
> but they're free to stomp all over anyone who wants to buy an evil deadly,
> baby-killing switchblade knife. I noticed that in Oregon, to its eternal
> credit, the Oregon State Shooting Association came out against a similar
> measure which came before the Oregon legislature this year.
> At least SOMEBODY understands the relationship.
>
> When legislators can't get any work done at all, much less have spare time to
> chase page boys around the Rotunda, because their staffers are tied up 150%
> of the time dealing with angry calls and letters EVERY SINGLE TIME ANY
> legislation comes up restricting access to ANY physical object, they'll
> start getting the message.
>

Think about it.

73,
Gene

x
--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares
are destined to plow for those who don't.
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1993 01:05:30 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

n4hy@harder.ccr-p.ida.org (Bob McGwier) writes:

>

> From Pellico's baseless statements:

Baseless? Do your homework and you'll find out it isn't quite that way.
In the '89 drive for the no-code license the ARRL did not publish the
results of those so-called "surveys".

#define FLAME_MODE ON

And by the way McGwier, learn how to spell my name, it's
P-E-L-L-I-C-C-I-O. I mean, it only says it on my .sig and on the header
of the message. Stupid fuckwad!

#define FLAME_MODE OFF

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
         /|   \_/
    /  | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
*  || { } ||
   ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^
-----
```

Date: 21 Jul 93 04:51:59 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uwm.edu!
ogicse!henson!netnews.nwnet.net!raven.alaska.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!

casbah.acns.nwu.edu!park@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Foreigner getting US liscence ?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul19.105601.27922@ennews.eas.asu.edu> shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu
(Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>Yes, I believe you can get a U.S. ham license. However, I would sure hope
>you could turn that license back into an equivalent class license when you
>go back home. I'd be looking into that. If so, then definitely go for it!

I don't want that much, tough :-)

As long as I can get US license, it's fine for now.

I think I can take another exam for higher calss license after I return
to my country if it's necessary.

BTW, thanks for all who resposned to my question via emails and followups.
They reminded me of a phrase: "Amateur is friendly" :-)

Cheers !

--

Yongsup Park(9Z ?k <7) \ park@anmsd3.msd.anl.gov / Intentionally
Physics & Astronomy Dept. \ park@casbah.acns.nwu.edu / left as a
Northwestern University \ B40180@ANLVCV1.BITNET / blank space.

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 01:43:31 GMT
From: mercury.hsi.com!a3bee2!cyphyn!randy@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:
: In article <22h0qdINNlpo@network.ucsd.edu> brian@nothing.ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor)
writes:
:
: >Yes, the days when one's ability to "pound brass" was sufficient to
: > - Brian
:
: I agree that code should not be the *only* factor, I'm not even sure how much
: of a factor it should be, but when in the history of amateur radio (in the US)
: was pounding brass *sufficient* to guarantee someone a ham license? From what
: I have heard from hams, including one licensed continuously since 1933 or so,
: there have always been theory tests, and they used to be completely essay type
: tests.
:
: I'm not saying there should not be change, but I would think that the essay
: tests given in 1933 would be *slightly* more difficult than today's
: "multiple-guess" tests. Thus, "pounding brass" is not, and never has been,
: sufficient to guarantee entry into amateur radio.
:
:
: --
: Will Turner, N0RDV -----

Excuse me! Can I point out something everyone seems to be overlooking?

It is not hazing.....the tests are to find out if or not one knows what they are doing, to try and make sure that responsible people are going to be at the controls.

Back in '33 one had to know how to dip the plate (NO! it is not a procedure used in a restaurant), or there would be some serious problems.

Back in '33 the 2 major modes of transmission were CW and AM...so, one had to know how to operate their rigs accordingly, and the tests were to find out if you did or not.

Now, with all these new sets, that auto-tune, and all kinds of transmission modes....most fully automatic...all one does is push the SEND button...it's not so great a concern about how one runs their rig, but how they will communicate over it.

However, the tests are not quite 'right' and so instead of being a means to insure one knows what they are doing, well.....

It has ended up being a last defence against letting in all kinds of people who'd use it like how C/B is being used....miserably adjusted rigs, radio-terrorism (intentional QRM), a podium to air ones hate and dislikes (practically broadcasting) of some of the most-to-be-avoided topics there are, generally carefree and disregarding everything but what THEY want.

That is not wanted , thats not what Ham radio is for, and people are seeing such stuff creep in, and are concerned!

So, the test , has ended up being a sort of hurdle, with maybe this idea: If they can't put in the time /effort to learn a little CW and some very basic theory, then they are not serious about being responsible people, and so they may be best to get a 27mc radio.

I would like to see the tests reflect more of what is really needed:

Basic station operating principles, to include enough antenna theory, feed line theory, so the person can operate with out causing RFI due to a mess for an antenna and feed line.

Basic operating procedures...I dont mean this Charlie Bravo RST is 379 jazz but....I guess, radio-etiquette. To be able to get on and not get a lot of people irritated due to sloppy/unknowing/carefree use of a freq.

This might include a little bit on public relations (to not make things worse)

Basic safty...both electrical andantenna support wise/installing etc.

Then....to get on bands that can put one in contact with places beyond your own town/state, (HF, any mode) a some what more intensive look at 'etiquette'....sence then one is representing the USA to all those who tune in.

So same for ... well lets say CW....To be authorized to use CW, one must be able to send and receive it , readably. (I hear some cheers somewhere)

NOW! Would anyone call THAT hazing?

Does anyone have any idea just what kind of Pandora's box would be opened if both CW and theory tests were done away with????
1912 Bedlam!

73

Randy, KA1UNW

(I got into Ham radio BECAUSE of CW)

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 16:49:17 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:

> OK.... try this one:
>
> If ordering food, does it have to be for the consumption of the licensee?
> Can you order food on behalf of (a) another ham and (b) an unlicensed person?
>
> Dave
>

I dunno... we may need to pass a Third-Party Food
Consumption ruling.... Man we thought people were jumping on the
ARRL about the no-code history.... Wait until this hits the fan!!!

73 de N8VUR / Doug

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 16:33:37 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

randy@cyphyn.UUCP (Randy) writes:

>
> I guess you guys didn't hear about that new petition going around, that
> wants to remove all 'phone from 160--10 meters, and have only CW .
>
> Randy, KA1UNW
>

Oh yeah... I did hear about that! Something about the feeling
that not enough amateurs use CW anymore, so they want strictly CW on all
of the HF amateur bands. (Next they're going to make those electric
paddles illegal too.... I guess they sound too much like a computer!)

-- Douglas A. Dever -- 73 de N8VUR floyd@wariat.org

QSO on 444.600 or 146.52 anytime!

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 01:55:53 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!iat.holonet.net!bwilkins@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Order pizza on your autopatch now
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:
: dave@llondel.demon.co.uk (David Hough) writes:
:
: > Does this mean that people can't endlessly debate whether it is legal
: > anymore? What will they all moan about now? I daresay someone will try and
: > abolish CW next :-)
: >
: > Dave
: >
:
: Naw! They'll move on from that and try to recall all the no-code
: licenses! :)

Thats right ! The steam driven computer will then re-issue the licences
with Advanced priviledges.... ;}

--
Bob Wilkins n6fri voice 440.250+ 100pl san francisco bay area
bwilkins@holonet.net packet n6fri @ n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: Tue, 20 Jul 93 16:38:52 EDT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: References for Code vs. No-Code Debate 82-90
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Here are some of the ARRL and members of the ARRL's opinions that were
published in QST ranging from September 1982 to September 1990.

Format: yymmm page Heading
 Title, Author

82SEP 56 Happenings
Codeless U.S. Amateur License? Commision Tells Staff to Write a Proposal

82NOV 9 "It Seems to Us..."

No Time for No-Code

82DEC 55 Article

Some Thoughts on the Morse Code, Victor C. Clark W4KFC (President ARRL)

82DEC 73 Correspondence

More No-Code, Daniel C. McKenzie AI9D

83FEB 66 Correspondence

No-Code - A "Cohn" Job?, Fred Rosenbury KA1GEN

83MAR 9 "It Seems to Us...."

The FCC No-Code Proposal: Ready or Not, Here it Comes

83MAR 49 Article

FCC Proposal for "Codeless" Operator License Class, FCC NPRM

83APR 9 "It Seems to Us...."

FCC Filings: Quality vs. Quantity, David Sumner K1ZZ

83APR 61 Correspondence

DE-"Cohn" Job?, James R. Musselman K06P

No-Code Compromise, Jim Sanford N0AIH

83MAY 44 Article

Inside ARRL: W4KFC and K1ZZ Speak Out

83JUN 9 "It Seems to Us...."

Board Stands Firm on No-Code

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the ARRL in Annual Meeting assembled that the General Manager is directed to prepare, for filing by Counsel, comments in the matter of PR Docket 83-28 stating in the strongest possible manner the opposition of the League to the creation of an amateur license class that does not require a demonstration of a knowledge of the Morse Code."

(Interesting quote!)

83SEP 61 Happenings

League Comments Lambaste No-Code Proposal

83OCT Happenings

No-Code Reply Comments, ARRL

84FEB Happenings

FCC Drops No Code!

84MAR Correspondence

No-Code: The End, Jeff Naylor N9DGO

84APR Correspondence

Thanks for No No-Code, Gordon Woroshelo VE3EYW

84JUL Correspondence

W2NSD and the Code, John F. Hall NA7R

" , Dr. Robert J. Ward K0SRL

84SEP Correspondence

Witty Reply to Savage Responce, Randy Lilly N3ET

84DEC Correspondence

The Return of No-Code, Edward Mitchell WA6A0D

(For the years between 1984 and 1988 it seems that the no-code issue gets viritually no coverage whatsoever in QST.)

88NOV 62 Correspondence

CW - Obsolete?, W.A. Swanson N8IKW

88DEC 79 Correspondence

Lost Spectrum and a No-Code VHF License, David Greer WE4K

89JAN 9 "It Seems to Us..."

Why Morse Code?, Larry E. Price W4RA, and David Sumner K1ZZ

89JAN 78 Correspondence

CW Obsolete? No Way!, Jim Whit K1ZX

" , Andrew Singer WK2F

" , David L. Wiesen K2VX

" , Sgt Anthony Engracio N4FP0

" , Hans K. Hildebrand KA1PCJ

" , George R. "Bob" Howe KB9JR

" , Ron Smith KF7JF

" , Steve Kirschner WY6P

" , Stan Gibilisco W1GV

" , Mike Gilbreath N4OHB

" , Scott J. Gottfried N0HOT

" , Bruce Vaughan NR5Q

89FEB 76 Correspondence

Lost Spectrum - What's the Answer?, William D. Cleveland WD5IBY

A No-Code VHF Digital License, George Schnepf KE2IV

89MAR 54 Happenings

Team to Study No-Code Issue

79 Correspondence

Code or No-Code: The Great Debate, Bill Raab KB0BSR
", Chuck Martin AB4Y
", Jean F. Eskridge N0JZH
", Michael A. Covington N4TMI
", Jim Brooks, Jr. N4SRT
", Brad Wells KR7L
", Karl H. Muller W3UBQ
", Dr. Milton Cohen WA3LBA
", F. Paul Kosbab NF4E

89APR 77 Correspondence

No-Code License: The Pro, Bob Locher W9NKI
", John Osborne W1KFY
", Gerald E. Christen W3EXD
", Hayes Steinhauser W2DZ
", Terrence R. Redding WB5LMJ
", James E. Taylor W2OZH
", Harry L. Helms AA6FW

And the Con... , Mike Kelly N4RXC
", Richard Steck W9RS
", David L. Heller K3TX
", Joe Phillips W2DHV

89JUN 68 Moved and Seconded...

Agenda item 2.5 Consideration of Report of the Committee to Study a Possible Code-Free License.

89JUN 76 Correspondence

I'm Against a Code-Free License, Dr. Paul A. Grayce K3LLH
", Paddy Liles W9LOH
", Michael Holgate (License Pending)
", Fred "Skeets" Senter N6SZT
", Wayne E. Wright W5XD

Publicity: THE Answer?, Gordon L. Anderson N8CCC

", Charles M. Seay, Sr.

A Code-Free License: Ham Radio's Salvation, Ed Vosicky W0JT
", Walter Bollinger AF3V
", James Kaplan N7LXQ
", Mark C. McCarthy KA2UIC
", Ben Johnson NY00
", Larry D. Shaunce WD0AKX
", Nicholas L. DeCarlo KA7VLH

89JUL 47 Article

The Case for Code, Rick Booth KM1G

89JUL 62 Correspondence

In Support of a Codeless VHF/UHF License, Jim DiTucci N2IXD
 " " , John E. Vercellino WB90VV
 " " , John Carp GM8XFT
 " " , Jean-Michel Quetin F6ADT
 A Codeless License is No Good, George A. Lucchi W6NVN
 " " , Thomas H. Cash, Jr. K4ZQX
 Solutions..., Jeff Rahmel KA8ZAW
 " " , Matther Horbund (Novice pending)

89AUG 66 Correspondence

The Committee Recommendation on a No-Code License, Steve Kirschner WY6P
 Get The Right Information, Warren Erdman K3ZXQ
 Recruitment Efforts, Paul W. Schleck KD3FU (Yes, he's on the net)

89SEP 13 League Lines

89SEP 9 "It Seems to Us..."

A Codeless License: The Time Has Come, David Sumner K1ZZ

89SEP 56 Moved and Seconded...

Agenda Item 39

89NOV 53 Happenings

ARRL Petitions FCC for Codeless Class of Amateur License

90APR 38 Article

FCC Releases Codeless License NPRM

90SEP 54 Article

Board Affirms Code-free License stance, Rick Palm K1CE

```

-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com                      Soon W5YI VE
      \____/
  _____(oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  ____  \
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
*  ||{____}||
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
ow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  ____  \
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
*  ||{____}||
  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)

```

Date: 21 Jul 93 02:06:07 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!orion.oac.uci.edu!easu348@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I agree with the writer that this is poor handling of the situation. I took my test at a local Red Cross chapter HQ, and they sent the papers in the next day, and I got my license in just under 8 weeks. I would think that everyone should have a Red Cross building somewhere near them. Just an idea for the people reading this who have yet to take the test.

--
Andrew Parker | KD6TGM | easu348@orion.oac.uci.edu

Date: 20 Jul 1993 18:26:21 -0700
From: techbook.com!techbook.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

After mentioning to a friend that the 8 week wait for my ticket had come and gone with no ticket in sight, he sent me the following (caustic) mail. I initially discounted his sarcasm, but, live and learn!

=====
If the sad truth might offend you, press n now.

=====
> To: genew@techbook.com
> Subject: Okay... Since you asked,
> Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1993 15:06:07 -0700
> From: David Simmons <davids@ims.com>
> Status: RO
>
>
> I KNOW who's holding up your license. It's... (drum roll...)
>
> Repeter Peter!
>
> It's buried on his desk where he works, at the headquarters of the
> ARRL (Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers).

>
> In case you're wondering who he is, if you'll give it a moment's thought,
> you've seen him any number of times.
> He's at every "bunny hunt", "field day", etc.
> You can recognize him by his bumbling gait, his beat-up "juicer hat",
> (you know, the kind with the brim turned down all the way around,
> that looks sort of like a tortoise road-kill), with all the pins and
> buttons on it that he's gotten from various ham "gatherings",
> and - of course, NEVER leave home without it - his HT, which he holds
> clutched in his hand at all times.
>
> Your license might or might not surface on his desk eventually.
> He only goes to work, (taking the term loosely), at ARRL about 2 or 3 days
> a week, and even when he's there, he spends most of his time leaning on
> things near the desks of the others of his kind who work (?) there,
> chewing the rag, (as best he can with dentures), and distracting THEM
> from doing anything about the pile of license applications on THEIR desks.
>
> About the only way you'll ever get the application to surface is to go
> directly to where Peter works, and catch him there. You might have to
> camp out overnight several nights, but eventually he'll show up.
> At that point, you can inform him that because, due to HIS intransigence,
> you are unable to get a license, you're going to start transmitting
> WITHOUT ONE. Even though you have no intention of doing any such thing,
> the mere suggestion of ANYone doing ANYthing to violate ANY sort of
> regulation, however small and insignificant, will brutally yank any
> Anally Retentive Regulation Lover such as Peter out of its antenna
> daydreams, and back to semi-reality. And the implication that HE
> is RESPONSIBLE for this will further cause him to shuffle back to his
> desk and start shuffling through papers in search of your license
> application.
> Hopefully, he'll find it before the adrenalin wears off.
> (Hopefully, the adrenalin in his system won't counteract the nitroglycerin
> and cause a heater-to-cathode short, in which case your application will
> never see the light of day again...)
>
> There is another alternative: you COULD just go reapply and take the test
> again, this time using a REAL license-processing facility such as... what was
> it - W5YI, or something? and write it off as a learning experience in how to
> recognize an Anally Retentive Regulation Lover in general,
> a Repeter Peter specifically,
> and - most importantly - how to steer clear of both...

Having read his opinion, I thought, NO WAY! Those folks at ARRL know what it's like to wait around for the government to move forward. They will move heaven and earth to get the paperwork to the FCC ASAP.

NOT!!!!!!!

I called the ARRL VE info number, 1-800-9ARRLVE.

The local testing group sent the paperwork in promptly, by overnight mail.

The Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers hung onto it for 17-19 days!

I quote the ARRL representative,
"The laws allows both the local VE's and the ARRL to take up to 10 DAYS each."

Not only did the ARRL use it's 10 day allotment but sucked up the field VE's as well.

As you may have noticed, I am not impressed!

Their representative reminded me of how much faster and more efficient they are compared to the FCC and recommended that I call my Congressman and ask for more money for the FCC. That, said he, will speed things up.

I am not going to hold my breath waiting for the government to speed ANYthing up no matter how much money they get.

Does anyone know what the hell the ARRL does with the license stuff?
Is it SO bloody complicated that it needs to take WEEKS?

It will probably be a cold day in hell before the FCC improves but can't we do something to help out the ARRL?

My "positive" suggestion:

If they need more people, I for one would cheerfully double, triple, or quadruple the \$5.60 fee for testing if it got the damn papers shuffled expeditiously!

You can't buy a rubber dummyload for your HT for \$20. What's \$20 to whack 2-3 weeks off of the already interminable wait for your license?

I had made a commitment to help provide emergency communications at an upcoming event. I prefer to keep my commitments, but I don't seem to have any options this time.

There, I feel a little better now....

I'd feel a damn sight better if my paperwork was on a reasonable schedule!

--

Those who beat their swords into plowshares
are destined to plow for those who don't.
genew@techbook.COM

Please direct flames to: genew@ucant.gethere.frmhere

Date: 21 Jul 93 02:19:40 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: The Great CODE Debate / Police Dispatchers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

*****Jerry Gardner JERRY@ISI.COM Wrote:

>relevance as code does, I'm afraid. One does not need to know electronic
>theory to be a competent operator. I doubt the average police dispatcher
>knows even the vaguest hint of theory, but no one questions their
>operating competency.

>

*****David Willmore WILLMORE@IASTATE.COM Comments about what Jerry says***
about Police Dispatchers*****

>To 'yap' on a 2m repeater, you only need a no-code tech license which
>has just a tiny amount of theory to its test. If all you want to do is
>'yap', why do you need more than a nc Tech?

>

>I guess there's an assumed correlation between electronic knowledge and
>operating competency. Whether that's true, I don't know.

>

And Tim Wright KD40VM WRIGHT@morekypr.BITNET
A HAM and a POLICE DISPATCHER says this:

I work with a bunch of STUPID PEOPLE when it comes to the operations of
radio equipment. It's really not their fault that they are this way.
One co-worker I work with threatened to quit because the State computer
system was changing computers and upgrading the system. **I really wished
she had quit but*****because it took her forever to learn the old system.

As the above pertains to Ham Radio I am the only Ham licensed Police
Communicator in my State Police post region : that I know of :
but in our local Rescue squad there are 5 licensed hams that work not
only communications but in the field and the youngest of them is only
15 years old. :she works along side of one of us senior operators :
and does one HELL of a great job....

We were in a staff meeting one day and my Chief's boss asked all of us
:officers and dispatcher: what is the one main fault of our system (Police
department). I raised my hand and told him our old out dated radio system.
that it was going to get someone KILLED and I didn't want that on MY SHIFT!!.
A few days later I was in his office and he shot off his mouth and asked
What gave ME the right to say what is right or what is wrong with the
police radio system. I very PROUDLY told him that I was a LICENSED
AMATEUR RADIO OPERATOR. and the conversation ended there with him saying
Appears to me that you're the only S.O.B. down there that knows what he

is talking about.....So Even though some states require their dispatchers to be State and Federally trained that is only in the BASICS very basic is what their given. I really feel sorry for some that are told PUSH TO TALK LET IT GO TO LISTEN.

Enuf said
tim KD40VM

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 93 05:12:07 GMT
From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!en.ecn.purdue.edu!n9ljx@purdue.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net>, <22g212\$6b8@access.digex.net>,
<CAHtpR.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com>9ljx
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

In article <CAHtpR.5Fu@feenix.metronet.com> marchbg@feenix.metronet.com (Marc Grant) writes:

>
>Okay - can you order ham sandwiches?

"OK Sir - 2 Ham sandwiches. Would you like Code or NoCode with that?"

--sas

--
Scott Stambaugh - N9LJX internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu
Operations Supervisor, ADPC phone: 317 494 7946
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1061

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1993 02:32:15 GMT
From: olivea!pagesat!spssig.spss.com!feenix.metronet.com!marchbg@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <743039810snx@llondel.demon.co.uk>, <22dsa9\$214@sun1.clark.net>,
<22g212\$6b8@access.digex.net>m
Subject : Re: Order pizza on your autopatch now

Okay - can you order ham sandwiches?

--
Marc B. Grant, N5MEI | marchbg@feenix.metronet.com | 214/231-3998 (voice)

P.O Box 850472 | marcbg@esy.com | 214/231-0025 (fax)
Richardson, TX 75085 |

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #243
